



Juridical Analysis of Hospital Obligations in Providing Emergency Medical Services

¹ Z.Noor, ² A.Oktavianus

^{1,2} Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia

Article History :

Received date : 2024/10/19

Revised date : 2024/11/02

Accepted date : 2024/12/15

Published date : 2025/01/01



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Abstract

Introduction: Emergency medical services constitute a fundamental component of the right to health, requiring immediate and non-discriminatory intervention to prevent mortality or permanent disability. This study analyzes the legal framework governing hospital obligations in emergency scenarios, particularly focusing on the tension between public law duties and private institutional autonomy. **Methods:** This research employs a normative juridical method, utilizing a statutory approach, conceptual analysis, and case study evaluations to examine relevant health legislation, ministerial regulations, and judicial precedents. **Results:** The findings indicate that statutory frameworks impose strict statutory duties on all healthcare facilities, irrespective of their public or private ownership, to provide immediate stabilization therapies without demanding upfront financial deposits. However, regulatory ambiguities regarding the definition of emergency thresholds and the mechanisms for state-backed financial reimbursement create systemic compliance vulnerabilities. **Discussion:** The literature review demonstrates that while

international human rights standards recognize medical emergencies as non-derogable obligations, domestic enforcement often suffers from a lack of harmonization between administrative sanctions and civil liability. The legal gap centers on the protection of emergency physicians who face conflicting pressures between corporate hospital protocols and statutory healthcare mandates, necessitating clear legal protections and standardized triaging protocols.

Conclusions: This study concludes that statutory hospital obligations must be reinforced by synchronized enforcement mechanisms and statefunded safety nets to ensure institutional compliance. It is recommended that regulatory bodies establish an objective legal definition of medical emergencies and formulate robust financial reimbursement policies to safeguard both patient rights and hospital sustainability.

Keywords: Emergency Services, Hospital Obligation, Normative Juridical, Right to Health, Medical Liability.

Introduction

The fulfillment of the right to health represents a core constitutional mandate that requires comprehensive statutory protection, particularly concerning the provision of emergency medical services. In the hierarchy of medical interventions, emergency care occupies a critical position where temporary delays directly correlate with irreversible physiological deterioration or death. Under contemporary legal systems, hospitals operate not merely as economic corporate entities but as social instruments bound by public law obligations to preserve human life. The core legal problem arises from the recurring systemic tension between the statutory obligations imposed upon hospitals to deliver immediate, non-refundable emergency stabilization and the operational, financial realities of private healthcare institutions. This research aims to comprehensively evaluate the scope of legal responsibilities borne by hospitals during emergency situations, analyze the potential sanctions for non-compliance, and clarify the boundaries of institutional liability. The practical and theoretical benefits of this study include providing clear legal guidance for healthcare administrators to mitigate litigation risks and offering a systematic framework for lawmakers to refine current health legislation. The

underlying hypothesis of this research states that ambiguities in the definitions of emergency criteria and the absence of clear reimbursement mechanisms lead to inconsistent statutory enforcement and increased legal exposure for medical facilities. While previous legal scholarship has addressed patient rights broadly, a distinct research gap persists regarding the specific intersection of administrative coercion, civil tort liability, and the criminal negligence of institutional entities in emergency care. The novelty of this study lies in its integrated analysis of corporate liability frameworks applied specifically to emergency triage failures, establishing a novel juridical model for balancing public health mandates with institutional sustainability.

Methods

This study is conducted using a normative juridical research methodology, which relies primarily on secondary data sources rather than empirical field observations. The legal research design is built upon a qualitative analysis of existing statutory instruments, authoritative legal doctrines, and relevant judicial precedents concerning medical malpractice and institutional negligence. The research utilizes a statutory approach to scrutinize national health laws and ministerial decrees, coupled with a conceptual approach to dissect the legal definitions of force majeure, emergency criteria, and the duty of care. Primary legal materials consist of binding legislative acts, constitutional provisions, and government regulations governing hospital operations. Secondary legal materials comprise peer-reviewed law journals, authoritative medical-legal textbooks, and explanatory legal commentaries. The data collection process involves systematic legal literature screening, archiving, and categorizing according to hierarchical statutory authority. The gathered legal materials are subsequently analyzed using formal legal interpretation techniques, including grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretations, to deduce clear conclusions regarding the exact scope of hospital liabilities.

Results

The normative legal analysis reveals that the statutory framework establishes an absolute, non-derogable obligation for all hospitals to provide immediate medical

stabilization to any individual facing a life-threatening condition. Legislation explicitly prohibits healthcare facilities from refusing emergency patients based on socio-economic status, racial background, or the inability to provide an upfront financial deposit. The law categorizes emergency care as a public safety exception where ordinary contract-based physician-patient relationships are superseded by a statutory duty of care. Furthermore, the findings indicate that failure to comply with these emergency mandates triggers severe, multi-layered legal consequences. Administratively, non-compliant hospitals face sanctions ranging from formal written reprimands and financial penalties to the permanent revocation of their institutional operational licenses. From a civil law perspective, a hospital's refusal to administer emergency treatment constitutes a tortious act under the doctrine of unlawful acts, rendering the institution liable for substantial compensatory damages. In terms of criminal liability, corporate entities and their management can be prosecuted for criminal omission or lethal negligence if the denial of care results in the patient's death or permanent disability. Despite these rigorous statutory provisions, the research identifies a substantial structural flaw: current legislation fails to provide an objective, standardized legal threshold for what constitutes a medical emergency, leaving the determination entirely to subjective clinical or administrative discretion, which frequently results in legal disputes.

Discussion

The legal nature of a hospital's obligation in emergency scenarios must be understood through the lens of public interest over private corporate autonomy. Academic literature across jurisdictions confirms that while ordinary medical services are based on consensual civil contracts, emergency medical care is governed by statutory mandates that create an extraordinary duty of care. Legal scholars argue that when a patient presents a life-threatening condition, the hospital enters into an involuntary legal relationship where the standard elements of contractual offer and acceptance are irrelevant. The literature review shows that international human rights instruments consider the denial of emergency care a direct violation of the right to life, which implies that domestic laws must enforce strict compliance mechanisms. However, the legal reality within domestic

frameworks reveals a deep fragmentation between theoretical statutory expectations and actual enforcement.

A profound analysis of the institutional liability framework demonstrates that hospitals frequently attempt to shield themselves from liability by citing financial insolvency risks or a lack of specialized critical care infrastructure. This study argues that such justifications are legally unsustainable under the doctrine of strict corporate liability for public welfare services. The law presumes that by obtaining a medical license, a hospital assumes the inherent operational risks of providing emergency stabilization as a social function. Therefore, arguments centered on a patient's inability to pay cannot dissolve the legal obligation to prevent immediate harm. The literature underscores that the primary objective of emergency intervention is stabilization rather than a complete cure; hence, hospitals are legally required to utilize all available resources to bring the patient to a medically stable state before executing an administrative transfer to another facility.

Despite the clarity of the stabilization mandate, a significant research gap remains regarding the protection of medical personnel caught between corporate budgetary restrictions and statutory obligations. When hospital administrators impose restrictive economic protocols that conflict with urgent patient needs, the treating physician faces severe ethical and legal dilemmas. This study notes that current legal frameworks fail to provide adequate whistle-blower protections or immunity from corporate retaliation for physicians who prioritize statutory emergency duties over internal administrative policies. To bridge this regulatory gap, it is essential to establish an objective, legally binding triage protocol that standardizes emergency classifications across all public and private institutions, thereby eliminating subjective administrative assessments. Furthermore, the state must introduce an independent, publicly funded reimbursement mechanism specifically designated to cover the costs of indigent emergency care, ensuring that the financial burden of public health mandates does not compromise the operational integrity of private healthcare providers.

Conclusion

This study concludes that hospitals bear an absolute, legally binding obligation to provide immediate, non-discriminatory emergency medical services to stabilize patients facing life-threatening conditions, independent of financial considerations. The existing normative framework establishes severe administrative, civil, and criminal liabilities for institutions that fail to comply with this statutory mandate. However, the efficacy of these legal provisions is severely undermined by the lack of clear, objective criteria defining medical emergencies and the absence of a structured financial safety net for private hospitals. To remedy these deficiencies, it is highly recommended that the ministry of health formulate precise, legally enforceable triaging regulations that standardize emergency thresholds across all medical sectors. Additionally, the government must enact a specialized legislation establishing a national emergency medical reimbursement fund to compensate hospitals for uncompensated stabilization care, thereby harmonizing patient rights with the economic viability of healthcare institutions.

References

- Adami, J., & Rahayu, S. (2022). *Principles of Medical Law and Institutional Liability*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Black, H. C. (2019). *Black's Law Dictionary* (11th ed.). St. Paul: Thomson Reuters.
- Fuady, M. (2021). *Perbuatan Melawan Hukum: Pendekatan Kontemporer*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Hendrik, K. (2023). *Etika dan Hukum Kesehatan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: EGC Medical Publisher.
- International Commission of Jurists. (2020). *The Right to Health and Non-Derogable Obligations in Public Emergencies*. Geneva: ICJ Publishing.
- Journal of Health Law and Policy. (2024). Analisis Yuridis Implementasi Pelayanan Gawat Darurat pada Rumah Sakit Swasta. *Jurnal Hukum Kesehatan*, 12(2), 145-162.
- Ministry of Health Regulation No. 47 Year 2018 on Emergency Medical Services.
- Prasetyo, T. (2020). *Hukum dan Sistem Kesehatan Nasional*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Sutedi, A. (2022). *Tanggung Jawab Hukum Rumah Sakit Terhadap Kelalaian Medis*. Jakarta: Raya Press.

World Health Organization. (2021). *Regulatory Frameworks for Emergency Medical Teams: Guiding Principles and Legal Protections*. Geneva: WHO Press.

